



**THE IMPLICATIONS OF ECOSYSTEM DYNAMICS FOR
FISHERIES MANAGEMENT:
A CASE STUDY OF SELECTED FISHERIES IN THE
GULF OF PARIA, TRINIDAD**

by

SHANTA DHORAY
Research Department
Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago
Port-of-Spain
TRINIDAD

and

SONJA SABITA TEELUCKSINGH
Department of Economics
University of the West Indies
St. Augustine
TRINIDAD

*Presented at the 26th Annual Review Seminar
Research Department
Central Bank of Barbados
July 26-29, 2005*

**The Implications of Ecosystem Dynamics for Fisheries Management:
A Case Study of Selected Fisheries in the Gulf of Paria, Trinidad.**

Abstract

It is accepted that if fisheries resources are to remain renewable and able to sustain livelihoods, appropriate management practices must be implemented. Even while fisheries management grapples to resolve single-species issues, the biological and economic interactions among species mandate that, to be effective, management techniques must be based on more interactive and aggregate-level analyses. In order to implement these techniques, the actual links, and the potential impact of these links, among the fisheries must be established. Vector Autoregression (VAR) analysis has the potential to play an increasingly important role in ecosystem modelling for fisheries management. This study uses VAR analysis to demonstrate the quantitative impact of certain ecosystem changes on the productivity of the carite, honey shrimp and croaker fisheries of the Gulf of Paria, Trinidad, in the particular context of the ecosystem dynamics of trophic linkages, bycatch and multispecies fisheries. Four VAR models are constructed to investigate the extent to which these factors affect the production of the selected fisheries, and to evaluate the management implications of these linkages. The empirical analysis is further evidence that, if sustainable management of fishery resources is to be achieved, management practices based on more multi-species, ecosystem approaches must replace the traditional, single-species management techniques.

Keywords: Fisheries Management; Ecosystem Dynamics; Bycatch, Trophic Linkages, Multispecies Fisheries Vector Autoregressive Analysis (VAR); Gulf of Paria; Trinidad; Caribbean.

Introduction

For many small islands the marine environment can be the most important economic resource (Bass, 1993). It is commonly accepted that the marine resources available to island states can, if properly utilised, significantly contribute to the sustainable development of the region (Dolman, 1990). The small-scale artisanal fishery sector in particular plays a critical socio-economic role (Dolman 1990, FAO 1999). To island states in particular, therefore, proper management of the marine fishery resources is essential.

Fisheries management objectives are multiple in nature and may be characterised by internal conflict (Mardle *et al.*, 2002). There are many alternative management techniques designed to achieve the stated objectives (McAllister *et al.*, 1999). Current trends of declining fishery resources and habitat degradation indicate, however, that current management techniques, either in conceptualisation or implementation, are failing to sustainably manage the resources. During the past 50 years, the dominant fisheries management paradigm has been to focus on a target species at a time (FAO 2003). Failure has been linked to the fact that these management practices tend to reduce fisheries into their component parts, with stocks assessed on a species by species basis (Roberts 1997, Tegner and Dayton 1999, FAO 2003). It is now accepted that the complexity of fisheries requires sophisticated management processes (Cochrane, 1999, Gislason *et al.* 2000). Even as fisheries management struggles to resolve single-species issues, it is increasingly being called upon to take a multispecies and ecosystem perspective (Caddy and Cochrane 2001, FAO 2003).

The biological interactions among species require management techniques based on more aggregate-level analyses. Traditional fishery management models have, however, regarded exploited populations in isolation from their surrounding environment and have largely ignored species interactions (Goni, 1998). Because the ecosystem dynamics of species interactions are not accounted for, these models are not equipped to effectively manage the resources (Roberts 1997, Bax 1998, Arnason 2000, Caddy and Cochrane 2001, Manickchand-Heileman *et al.* 2004, Heymans *et al.* 2004).

Fisheries management objectives often assume that fishing mortality is the only factor that contributes to variation in species survival rates (Bax 1998, Goni 1998). Complex and

numerous species interactions through the dynamics of predation and competition can cascade through entire ecosystems via direct and indirect ecosystem effects (Bax 1998, Shannon and Cury 2003). Losses to predation can sometimes exceed losses to fisheries (Bax 1998). Yet the world's fisheries continue to remove large amounts of catch with little or no consideration of what may be the consequences of excessive removal or a predator or prey on the trophic structure (Parsons 1992, Bax 1998).

The incidental harvesting of unwanted, untargeted species or age classes is an issue that poses sustained challenges to fishery management and remains firmly on the fisheries and conservation agendas (Boyce 1996, Bache 2003). While bycatch may be of other fish species, it can sometimes include taxa very different to targeted harvests such as birds and mammals (Norman 2000). Bycatch can also often change the trophic structure of entire ecosystems with the encouragement of scavengers (Gislason *et al.* 2000, FAO 2003). Shrimp trawl fisheries in particular warrant particular attention, where the shrimp-catch is, in most cases, outweighed by the weight of the fish-dominated bycatch (Stratoudakis *et al.* 2001, Stobutzki *et al.* 2003).


The nature of the marine environment and the inherent non-selectivity of fishing gear imply that it is hardly practical or profitable to target a single species at any one time. Multispecies fisheries and their ecosystem effects are one of the most prevalent problems in fisheries, with the incorporation of multispecies dynamics into resource management being increasingly investigated and implemented (Squires and Kirkley 1995, Walters *et al.* 1997, Cochrane 1999, Arnason 2000, Le Pape and Vigneau 2001). A path of conservative management can often be the prescription for fisheries that consciously and simultaneously harvest, by the same gear, different species that are characterized by different points on the over-exploitation scale (Dedah *et al.* 1999).

In order to implement ecosystem management approaches that can effectively deal with the challenges posed by more holistic analysis, the interlinkages between the various ecosystem components and the potential impacts of these linkages must be established. This paper seeks to empirically demonstrate the ecosystem interactions of trophic linkages, bycatch and multispecies fisheries among the carite, croaker and honey-shrimp fisheries of the Gulf of Paria, Trinidad, and to evaluate the implications of these interactions for their future effective management.

The Gulf of Paria, Trinidad

The island of Trinidad is the most southerly of the Caribbean island chain. It lies just off the coast of Venezuela and is part of a twin island state known as Trinidad and Tobago. The west coast of Trinidad borders the waters of the Gulf of Paria, a shared body of water on the northeastern continental shelf of South America, between eastern Venezuela and the west coast of Trinidad, covering an area of 7600km² (Manickchand-Heileman *et al.*, 2004). The Gulf of Paria coastline is the most utilized coastal zone of the island of Trinidad and one of the most industrialised areas in the region. More than 90% of the country's 1.2 million population resides and works along the west coast and in the watershed areas draining into the Gulf of Paria (FAO, 1998).

Figure 1: Map of the Gulf of Paria (Manickchand-Heileman *et al.*, 2004)



The Gulf of Paria is an enclosed basin with a flat bottom and gentle slopes, and with an average depth of approximately 20 meters. Because of the island's proximity to the South American continent, the Gulf has often been defined as part of the greater Orinoco region of Venezuela (Boodoosingh 1992). The Orinoco is among the world's largest rivers and drains an area of approximately 9x10⁵ square kilometres in Colombia and Venezuela. Prevailing winds and currents result in the movement of outflow of the Orinoco directly into the Gulf of Paria. These nutrient rich and sediment laden waters contribute considerably to the high productivity to be found within the Gulf. The Gulf of Paria is presently the most active fishing area around the island of Trinidad (Boodoosingh, 1992).

Biologically, the marine fisheries of Trinidad and Tobago can be broadly categorised into

pelagic and demersal. The most important pelagic fishes are the carite, kingfish, cavalli and sharks, while the more important demersal stocks are the penaeid shrimp, croaker, sharks, snapper and salmon (Fisheries Division 1997). The industry has traditionally been an inshore and artisanal one, and remains largely unmanaged (Fisheries Division 1997, Manickchand-Heilemen *et al.*, 2004).

"Carite" is the local name for the Spanish mackerel *Scomberomorous brasiliensis*. In terms of weight it is the most commercially important species in Trinidad (Fisheries Division, 1993). The carite can live up to 9 years (Fishbase, 2004) and are coastal inhabitants. The carite has been found to spawn throughout the year with periods of peak spawning activity from October to April in the Gulf of Paria, from May to September on the Guyana shelf and from July to September off northeastern Brazil. The carite generally feeds on fishes, and to some extent on penaeid shrimps and squid. In Trinidad the carite is caught in the Gulf of Paria by a variety of gear types of which gillnets and lines are the most common (Fisheries Division, 1993). A preliminary assessment of the carite fishery of Trinidad conducted in 1991 indicated that the fishery was heavily exploited (Fisheries Division, 1993).

"Croaker" or "Cro Cro" is the local name for a popular groundfish *Micropogonias furnieri*. The whitemouth croaker has an average maximum age of 7 years with a maximum size of 60cm (Fishbase, 2004). Greatest spawning activity occurs from February to August. The croaker is found in muddy and sandy bottoms in coastal waters and in estuaries where the nursery and feeding grounds are located. Its feeding habits vary with its developmental stage and season; juveniles feed on benthic migratory crustaceans while adults are benthos feeders and occasionally capture fish (Fishbase 2004). It is an inshore fishery, with most fishing is done in depths between 9-14 meters. Croaker are fished by the gillnet fishery in the Gulf of Paria, whose main target species in the carite.

"Honey Shrimp" is the local name for one type of penaeid shrimp. *Xiphopenaeus Kroyeri*. The honey shrimp lives in coastal water, remaining inshore in fairly shallow waters. They are bottom-dwellers (benthic), preferring sandy/muddy substrates rich in organic matter such as river mouths and mangrove areas. They are usually filter feeders, feeding mainly on decomposing plant and animal matter. Penaeids are fast-growing animals with an extremely short lifespan of approximately 2 years. The major spawning period is from April to

November. Honey shrimp are harvested by the artisanal trawlers in the Gulf of Paria.

The challenges posed for single-species management approaches in terms of the ecosystem dynamics of trophic linkages, bycatch and multispecies fisheries can be illustrated via these three fisheries of the Gulf of Paria. A trophic link exists between the carite and honey shrimp, with shrimp constituting one of the species upon which the carite preys. Shrimp trawling is notorious for the bycatch it produces, and the croaker is a well-known and prominent bycatch of the shrimp trawl fishery (FAO Fisheries Report, 2001). The carite and croaker fisheries are both harvested by the same gear of gillnets.

Methodology

The goal of VAR analysis is to determine interrelationships among variables (Enders, 2004). VAR models are useful for policymaking, forecasting and causality analysis (Watson and Teelucksingh, 2002). They allow for interdependence among a set of endogenous variables, and as such have the potential to play an increasingly important role in ecosystem modelling for fisheries management. VAR models have been previously applied to fisheries interactions, analysis and forecasting (Stergiou 1991, Stergiou *et al.*, 1997, Dalton 2001). However, VAR analysis is not yet a widespread tool for fisheries researchers.

Four VAR systems are estimated in this paper, representing the three ecosystem dynamics issues of trophic linkages, bycatch and multispecies considerations as well as one aggregated system including all three fisheries variables. Monthly landings data for the carite, croaker and honey-shrimp fisheries for the period January 1995 – December 2002 were obtained from the Marine Fisheries Analytical Unit of the Fisheries Division, Ministry of Land, Agriculture and Marine Resources, Trinidad and Tobago. For the carite and croaker, this data was provided for the entire island, whereas landings and effort for the honey shrimp was obtained for the Gulf of Paria. However, because the Gulf of Paria is the most fished coastal region of the island, it is assumed that the majority of landings came from the Gulf and so is used as a proxy. Missing data points were filled via a process of moving averages.

The data analysis is performed using WinRATS and EViews. All three variables are first verified for stationarity using Augmented Dickey-Fuller unit root tests. Lag lengths are determined using both the Likelihood Ratio test and the AIC/SBC criteria. The inclusion of dummy variables to capture seasonal patterns are made on the basis of the Likelihood Ratio test compared across the restricted and unrestricted models. VAR estimations proceed on the basis of the imposition of Choleski decompositions that follow the causal chain among the variables. Evaluations are conducted through an analysis of impulse response functions and variance decompositions. Appendix A gives the VAR systems that are estimated in each of the four cases.

Trophic VAR Model Results: The Carite and Honey-Shrimp Fisheries

The carite and honey-shrimp species interactions illustrate trophic linkages due to the nature of their predator/prey relationship. As the carite feeds on the honey shrimp, one would expect that if carite landings increase, the honey shrimp population and therefore its harvest, will also increase as its major predator is undergoing greater removal via harvesting. Given the variation in life cycles of these two species, it would be expected that this effect is felt with a periodic lag.

Testing procedures reveal that the most appropriate lag length for this system is 2. The dummy variables are also determined to be significant and are included in the VAR specification. The Choleski decomposition that is imposed sets the current honey shrimp landings to zero, that is, the most appropriate causal chain is assumed to be:

Carite landings → Honey shrimp landings

Figure 2

Impulse Responses of a Shock to the Carite Landings Innovation




Figure 2 illustrates the effects on carite and honey shrimp landings of a shock to the carite landings innovation. The graphs indicate the response of first carite landings and then honey-shrimp landings to a one standard deviation shock. The first graph indicates that, as expected, carite landings immediately increase. This increase continues but at a decreasing rate, with the fishery eventually returning to equilibrium in period 24. The second graph indicates that, as carite landings are increased, honey shrimp landings first fall, and then sharply increase. These increases continue, though at a decreasing rate after period 6. There is a return to equilibrium in period 24. The initial decrease in honey-shrimp landings is feasibly indicative of the dynamic interplay of the two species, where it can be hypothesised that a rise in carite landings decreases the predator threat to the honey-shrimp fishery, which is then (after a lag) able to sustain greater population levels and by extension harvest levels.

Table 1

Variance Decompositions of Carite and Honey Shrimp Landings

Variance Decomposition of Carite Landings				Variance Decomposition of Honey Shrimp Landings			
Period	S.E.	CARITE	HONEY SHRIMP	Period	S.E.	CARITE	HONEY SHRIMP
1	90850.48	100	0	1	4536.385	0.764442	99.23556
2	123520.9	99.9243	0.075703	2	4835.971	5.118921	94.88108
3	137727.9	99.25109	0.748912	3	5027.623	4.991892	95.00811
4	143163.7	98.26093	1.739072	4	5090.61	6.357292	93.64271
5	145831.1	97.17166	2.82834	5	5180.362	8.773611	91.22639
6	147297	96.43493	3.565073	6	5241.551	10.51848	89.48152
7	148244.5	95.97089	4.029108	7	5284.771	11.62864	88.37136
8	148885.6	95.70036	4.299643	8	5310.989	12.2523	87.7477
9	149334.8	95.53537	4.464632	9	5327.897	12.62111	87.37889
10	149645.6	95.43103	4.568975	10	5338.741	12.84926	87.15074
11	149857.9	95.36186	4.638144	11	5345.976	12.99954	87.00046
12	150001	95.31515	4.684849	12	5350.831	13.10109	86.89891
13	150096.9	95.28338	4.716615	13	5354.121	13.17044	86.82956
14	150161.1	95.26186	4.738144	14	5356.344	13.21759	86.78241
••	••	••	••	••	••	••	••
24	150290.2	95.21834	4.781658	24	5360.848	13.31309	86.68691

Table 1 gives the variance decompositions of both the carite and honey-shrimp fisheries over 24 time periods. Note that in the first time period, the carite accounts for 100% of its change. This is due to the imposition of the Choleski decomposition that sets current honey shrimp landings in the carite landings equation to 0 (see Appendix A). Honey shrimp landings begin to affect carite landings in time period 2, but to a very small magnitude. The effects of honey shrimp landings on carite landings begin to increase across the time periods, where a seeming equilibrium of 4.7% is reached at period 13 and maintained until period 24. Turning now to the variance decomposition of the honey shrimp fishery, we can see that, while carite landings affect honey shrimp landings by only 0.7% in period 1, there is a considerable increase to 5% in period 2. There is then steady increase to period 12, where an approximate level of 13% seems to be maintained to the end of period 24.

These results are in keeping with the relative impacts of each species on the other in terms of trophic interactions, and also lend evidence to the *a priori* Choleski decomposition which, in this case, assumes the direction of causality to be from carite to honey shrimp. Shrimp is a part of the carite diet, and so it can be expected that as shrimp landings increase, carite

landings may fall due to the lower availability of the food source. However, shrimp is not the only element of the carite diet and, given the reputation of this species as a voracious feeder, it is reasonable to hypothesise that as the availability of shrimp decreases, the carite will be able to compensate with other food sources. Hence the relative effect of shrimp landings on carite landings only reaches 4.7%. This is not the case with an analysis of shrimp landings. While carite landings initially have a small effect, there are then jumps from period to period, until a high of 13% is reached. This indicates that, while shrimp removal may not play a large part in the survival of the carite, carite removal definitely plays an increasing role in the honey shrimp species viability. As more carite is landed, this analysis seems to indicate that this lowers the trophic pressure on the shrimp species, thereby allowing the species, in time, to regenerate to higher population levels which will then be reflected in higher levels of catches.

Bycatch VAR Model Results: The Croaker and Honey-Shrimp Fisheries

The croaker and honey-shrimp species interactions can indicate bycatch effects, given that croaker is a significant bycatch of the shrimp trawl fishery. This type of relationship would suggest that if there is an increase in the honey shrimp landings then croaker landings would fall, as a result of the increased mortality imposed upon croaker as a bycatch and so a reduction in the amount of croaker harvestable by man.

Testing procedures reveal that the most appropriate lag length for this VAR structure is 15. The dummy variables are determined to be significant and so are included in the VAR specification. The chosen Choleski decomposition sets current croaker landings in the first equation to zero. This is chosen due to the nature of the relationship between the both fisheries. The croaker is a bycatch of the honey shrimp, and so it is assumed that while it is affected by the honey-shrimp, it does not itself significantly affect the honey-shrimp. This decomposition therefore aims to propose that the causal chain is:

$$\text{Honey shrimp landings} \rightarrow \text{Croaker landings}$$

Figure 3
Impulse Responses of a Shock to the Honey Shrimp Landings Innovation




Figure 3 illustrates the responses of the honey shrimp and croaker fisheries to a shock in the honey shrimp landings innovation. The first graph indicates that a shock to the honey shrimp landings innovation causes honey shrimp landings to initially increase. This increase continues but at a decreasing rate, beginning to approach equilibrium from period 16. The shock to the honey shrimp landings innovation causes the croaker landings to initially decrease. It then increases but at fluctuating rates for the rest of the sample period. There may be an indication of equilibrium at period 22.

Table 2

Variance Decompositions of Honey Shrimp Landings and Croaker Landings

Variance Decomposition of Honey Shrimp Landings			
Period	S.E.	HONEY SHRIMP	CROAKER
1	3857.25	100	0
2	4022.014	99.9973	0.002701
3	4356.989	98.67531	1.324695
4	4659.195	95.11304	4.886957
5	4752.23	92.05268	7.947317
6	4823.861	91.35935	8.64065
7	4922.94	90.37767	9.622331
8	4997.949	88.14341	11.85659
9	5009.52	87.85222	12.14778
10	5062.992	86.01837	13.98163
11	5071.512	85.99288	14.00712
12	5077.674	85.78601	14.21399
13	5085.328	85.81616	14.18384
14	5170.92	84.52386	15.47614
15	5217.3	84.51913	15.48087
16	5230.073	84.17725	15.82275
17	5231.817	84.14651	15.85349
18	5248.953	83.69145	16.30855
19	5252.83	83.60627	16.39373
20	5259.859	83.61271	16.38729
21	5275.09	83.27193	16.72807
22	5306.98	82.63942	17.36058
23	5316.829	82.33775	17.66225
24	5323.739	82.15852	17.84148

Variance Decomposition of Croaker Landings			
Period	S.E.	HONEY SHRIMP	CROAKER
1	10388.92	0.930542	99.06946
2	12272.06	1.218962	98.78104
3	12505.05	1.568456	98.43154
4	12942.3	2.437454	97.56255
5	13203.93	4.557819	95.44218
6	13985.62	14.80297	85.19703
7	14917.17	20.95982	79.04018
8	15132.81	20.82063	79.17937
9	15168	20.7702	79.2298
10	15331.42	22.36028	77.63972
11	15342.01	22.4511	77.5489
12	15735.79	25.82515	74.17485
13	15945.83	25.32985	74.67015
14	16144.96	25.25179	74.74821
15	16545.43	27.78477	72.21523
16	16800.04	29.74072	70.25928
17	16950.73	30.74029	69.25971
18	17583.54	34.29223	65.70777
19	18369.98	39.36451	60.63549
20	19047.54	42.70147	57.29853
21	19330.69	43.75712	56.24288
22	19348.95	43.80932	56.19068
23	19428.18	44.11896	55.88104
24	19500.52	44.47175	55.52825

Table 2 gives the variance decompositions for both species. Croaker seems to have an increasing impact on honey shrimp from one period to the next, eventually settling at approximately 17%. However, an analysis of the variance decomposition for the croaker landings variable is much more startling. Beginning with a relatively small contribution of 0.9%, honey shrimp landings have impacts of increasing magnitudes on the croaker landings variable. Time periods are characterised by jumps in these increases, by a magnitude of as much as 10% from period 5 to period 6. By period 24, the honey shrimp landings are accounting for up to 44% of the croaker landings. These numbers not only lend credence to the *a priori* Choleski decomposition and the assumed direction of causality, but also indicate just how intimately these two fisheries are linked through the severe bycatch implications

which characterise the shrimp trawl fishery.

Multispecies VAR Model Results: The Carite and Croaker Fisheries

Because both the carite and croaker fisheries are harvested by the gillnet fishery, a joint analysis can bring to the fore the issue of multispecies fisheries. While croaker is of importance as a food fish, the carite is the species that is of greater commercial value. It is therefore assumed (and borne out by the data) that in any gillnet catch, the proportion of carite will far surpass that of the croaker landings. If we expect that there is some fixed capacity of the gillnet as a method of harvesting, this implies that a negative relationship should be expected between the carite and the croaker. An increase in carite landings should be accompanied by a fall in croaker landings, as the method of harvesting is taken to capacity.

Appropriate testing reveals that the lag length for this system is 2. The dummy variables are also found to be significant and so are included in the VAR specification. The chosen Choleski decomposition sets current croaker landings to zero. This decomposition aims to propose that, due to the commercial importance of carite, the causal chain is:

$$\text{Carite landings} \rightarrow \text{Croaker landings}$$

Figure 4

Impulse Responses of a Shock to the Carite Landings Innovation




Figure 4 illustrates the impulse responses of the carite and croaker landings variables to a shock in the carite landings innovation. As expected, this shock causes carite landings to increase, but at a decreasing rate until equilibrium is clearly reached at period 16. Croaker landings, however, fall steadily until equilibrium at period 16. The two opposing effects on these two variables, and the arrival at equilibrium at the same point in time, justify the initial hypothesis that, due to a limited gear capacity, increases in the landings of one will invariably imply decreases in the landings of the other.

Table 3

Variance Decompositions of Carite Landings and Croaker Landings

Variance Decomposition of Carite Landings				Variance Decomposition of Croaker Landings			
Period	S.E.	CARITE	CROAKER	Period	S.E.	CARITE	CROAKER
1	92017.66	100	0	1	16083.15	0.246615	99.75338
2	124970.5	99.89531	0.104691	2	18828.78	1.346797	98.6532
3	138774.3	99.88701	0.112987	3	19597.31	2.219139	97.78086
4	144620.1	99.68355	0.316445	4	19846.1	2.720565	97.27944
5	147180.7	99.42268	0.577317	5	19935.26	2.973751	97.02625
6	148328.8	99.21741	0.782585	6	19969.35	3.094396	96.9056
7	148848.2	99.08814	0.911857	7	19982.95	3.150228	96.84977
8	149083.1	99.0162	0.983797	8	19988.53	3.175634	96.82437
9	149188.8	98.97908	1.020917	9	19990.86	3.187072	96.81293
10	149236.2	98.96085	1.039154	10	19991.84	3.192183	96.80782
11	149257.4	98.95218	1.047823	11	19992.27	3.194456	96.80554
12	149266.8	98.94815	1.051852	12	19992.45	3.195463	96.80454
13	149271	98.94631	1.053694	13	19992.53	3.195907	96.80409
••	••	••	••	••	••	••	••
24	149274.2	98.9448	1.055198	24	19992.59	3.196257	96.80374

The variance decompositions of the two landings variables as shown in Table 3 indicate that, while the effects on each other are indeed small, the carite landings play a relatively larger role (3%) in the croaker landings than the croaker landings do in the carite landings (1%). This verifies the initial a priori direction of causality as imposed by the Choleski decomposition.

Aggregate VAR Model Results: The Interactions among the Carite, Croaker and Honey Shrimp Fisheries

The preceding analyses abstracted to 2x2 models of these three fisheries of the Gulf of Paria. However in reality, all species co-exist in time and space and trade-offs will invariably exist between the variables that interplay to keep ecosystems in a state of moving equilibrium. The three issues of trophic interactions, bycatch and multispecies fisheries are therefore now combined into a single, aggregate VAR model. The appropriate series of tests reveal that the most appropriate lag length for this system is 2. The dummy variables are found to be significant and are therefore included in the specification. The chosen Choleski decomposition sets current honey shrimp and croaker landings to zero. This ordering was

seen to be the most appropriate one based both on the relative commercial importance of these species as well as the results of the models analysed above. This decomposition therefore proposes that the causal chain is:

Carite landings → Honey Shrimp landings → Croaker landings

Figure 5
Impulse Responses of a Shock to the Carite, Honey Shrimp and Croaker Innovations




Figure 5 above illustrates the impulse responses of the three landings variables as a result of shocks to the carite, honey shrimp and croaker innovations respectively. The three graphs along the main diagonal of this illustration demonstrate the response of each variable to a shock in its own innovation. These results are clearly predictable – each one experiences increases but at decreasing rates until equilibrium is once more restored.

The graphs on the off diagonal positions of Figure 5 demonstrate the interactions that were previously analysed in a 2x2 manner with the earlier VAR models. In response to a shock to the carite landings innovation, honey shrimp initially falls but then increases, and continues to increase at a decreasing rate until equilibrium is restored. This can be accounted for by a lagged response to the lowering of the predator levels, as the eventual regeneration of the honey shrimp population to higher levels of equilibrium are, in time, reflected in increasing harvests. This innovation shock also causes croaker landings to face decreasing levels, due to the limited capacity of the common gear.

The second column of Figure 5 indicates the responses to a shock in the honey shrimp landings innovation. First we consider the response of the carite landings variable. After an initial fall, there is a strong increase that continues at a decreasing rate until equilibrium is attained. The initial fall can be accounted for by the fact that, as a factor in the carite diet, an increase in honey shrimp harvests may cause an initial decline in carite population and so carite harvests due to the role that honey shrimp plays in the carite diet. However, as the carite adjusts to other existing food sources, increases are soon experienced which are reflected in increasing harvests. As such, the increase in honey shrimp harvest plays only a small role in affecting the carite landings for a short time only.

The response of croaker landings to this innovation shock is surprisingly different to that illustrated in Figure 3. In Figure 5, we can see a small decrease in croaker landings that immediately returns to equilibrium by period 4. This is at odds with earlier results, and with knowledge of bycatch effects as a whole. It is expected that increases in honey shrimp landings would have a strong effect on croaker landings, and yet this is not illustrated here.

The third column of Figure 5 illustrates the response of the variables to a shock in the croaker landings innovation. Croaker landings have not been assumed as a causal variable, either in

earlier models or in this current, aggregate model. We see, however, that after an initial increase, carite landings seem to respond negatively to croaker landings. This is explained by the scenario of the common gear with limited capacity – as croaker landings increase, the carite landings must fall due to the competition for space in the gillnet fishery. Honey shrimp landings also seem to face a strong decrease from the increase in the croaker landings innovation, until period 3 is passed, after which these decreases start approaching equilibrium once more. This is again a surprising result, since earlier models reflected that the direction of causality lies strongly from honey shrimp to croaker due to the bycatch issues associated with shrimp trawling.

Table 4
Variance Decompositions of the Carite, Honey Shrimp and Croaker Landings

Variance Decomposition of Carite Landings					Variance Decomposition of Honey Shrimp Landings					Variance Decomposition of Croaker Landings				
Period	S.E.	CARITE	HONEY SHRIMP	CROAKER	Period	S.E.	CARITE	HONEY SHRIMP	CROAKER	Period	S.E.	CARITE	HONEY SHRIMP	CROAKER
1	90478.75	100	0	0	1	4360.685	1.061471	98.93853	0	1	16029.01	0.430038	0.587978	98.98198
2	122913.9	99.74962	0.125106	0.125272	2	4719.377	6.362161	91.60814	2.029698	2	18821.07	1.624739	0.89325	97.48201
3	136792.1	99.30735	0.591414	0.101234	3	4964.785	6.033372	89.40879	4.567839	3	19826.68	2.453571	0.851785	96.69464
4	142156.8	98.36629	1.416218	0.215497	4	5083.989	7.553658	86.60703	8.839977	4	19889.66	3.15662	0.846174	96.00521
5	144895.9	97.33838	2.328520	0.53509	5	5174.109	10.28776	83.41072	6.521523	5	19985.21	3.444403	0.846289	95.70922
6	146961.1	96.1738	2.91035	0.915848	6	5248.153	12.17559	81.30903	6.515383	6	20010.88	3.541889	0.846498	95.62982
7	147827.8	95.82279	3.240604	1.23811	7	5293.054	13.32087	80.05082	6.628305	7	20017.86	3.633092	0.847979	95.58893
8	148630.6	95.12857	3.408823	1.481605	8	5320.301	13.91879	79.36278	6.718422	8	20019.91	3.666887	0.84792	95.58519
9	149180.1	94.89187	3.501169	1.608983	9	5337.128	14.24586	78.98352	6.790618	**	**	**	**	**
10	149545.6	94.74728	3.554089	1.698848	10	5347.631	14.43589	78.71938	6.844728	**	**	**	**	**
11	149783.2	94.65575	3.587356	1.75889	11	5354.415	14.55574	78.56201	6.882251	**	**	**	**	**
12	149935.5	94.59852	3.609074	1.794407	12	5368.812	14.63413	78.45893	6.908939	**	**	**	**	**
13	150032.7	94.55786	3.623358	1.818796	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
14	150094.7	94.53289	3.632844	1.83487	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
15	150134.3	94.51642	3.638614	1.844965	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
16	150159.7	94.50597	3.642419	1.851607	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
17	150176	94.49929	3.644837	1.855873	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
18	150186.4	94.49502	3.646376	1.858806	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
24	150203.7	94.48796	3.64861	1.863126	24	5386.76	14.77947	78.27038	6.950163	24	20020.92	3.667692	0.847981	95.58433

Table 4 above gives the variance decompositions for all three landings variables. In each fishery, as is expected, the major player is the landings variable itself – 94% of the changes to carite, 78% of the honey shrimp landings and 95% of the croaker landings being explained by the variables themselves. Interestingly, this can lend some justification to management approaches that focus on single species. Of the honey shrimp and croaker variables, honey shrimp plays a relatively larger role in impacting the carite fishery (3.6%) than does the croaker variable (1.8%). The carite landings impact the honey shrimp landings by a much greater amount (14.7%) than does the croaker landings variable (6.95%). Finally, croaker landings are affected by the carite landings variable by 3.5%, as opposed to the honey shrimp landings of 0.84%.

Conclusions

By nature of their characteristics, small island economies can pay a heavy price for environmental degradation. The available fisheries resources in particular can provide substantial, indirect, non-economic benefits. Fish provides the basic source of animal protein for many SIDS, and figures heavily in the food security equation in these countries (FAO 1998). The fisheries sector is important not only as the provider of this food resource but also because it is an avenue for self-employment- this in a developing world context where employment opportunities are increasingly limited and labour decreasingly mobile across and between sectors due to sector industrialisation, and lack of skill and education as a barrier to entry. The harvesting and marketing of the resource can also present opportunities to the inhabitants to participate in an economic activity to which in some cases they would not otherwise have access.

There exists a high interdependence among fisheries due to the nature of the ecosystems in which species reside. While it is accepted that fisheries management is a crucial element in maintaining the long term sustainability of marine resources and the communities that depend upon them, management techniques that aim at one particular species can have unforeseen effects throughout the ecosystem unless a more dynamic and holistic approach is adopted. The interactions discussed in this paper are illustrative of this.

In this paper, analyses were conducted on the carite, croaker and honey shrimp fisheries of the Gulf of Paria, Trinidad. 2x2 models were constructed to investigate the ecosystem linkages of trophic interactions, bycatch, and harvesting by a common gear. Results indicated that, while the primary influence on the harvest level of these fisheries still remains the fisheries themselves, there is an increasing need to take into account the interactive effects of changes in landings with other ecosystem variables. Both the impulse response functions and the variance decomposition tables indicate that, if effective management is to be achieved, species cannot be considered in isolation of their ecosystem linkages. VAR models such as these have tremendous potential in the investigation of the potential ecosystem impacts of management techniques, in an immediate as well as a dynamic, inter-temporal sense.

Policies (or lack of) that compromise the integrity of this resource can have devastating effects, both in an immediate sense as well as in the longer term. The interlinked island ecosystems will respond to changes in one of the constituent parts. Furthermore, as the economy begins to respond to the environmental changes, shifts in the economic structure itself will impact the way in which the environmental resources are exploited. In the end, if marine resources are left unmanaged or at best managed in a less than holistic sense, it is the rural coastal communities of our small island economies and their future generations who will suffer the most.

Appendix A: The VAR Specifications

The General VAR Model Specification

The general form of a VAR model including two endogenous variables, X and Y, n lags and an exogenous variable Z can be represented as follows:

$$X_t = c_1 + a_{11}X_{t-1} + a_{21}X_{t-2} + \dots + a_{n1}X_{t-n} + b_{11}Y_{t-1} + b_{21}Y_{t-2} + \dots + b_{n1}Y_{t-n} + d_1Z_t + e_1$$

$$Y_t = c_2 + a_{12}X_{t-1} + a_{22}X_{t-2} + \dots + a_{n2}X_{t-n} + b_{12}Y_{t-1} + b_{22}Y_{t-2} + \dots + b_{n2}Y_{t-n} + d_2Z_t + e_2$$

where X_{t-n} and Y_{t-n} are the variables of interest n periods before time t ; c is a constant; a , b and d are coefficients of the model; and e_1 and e_2 are the error terms.

This general model is adapted below to each ecosystem dynamics case. The abbreviations are as follows:

c = carite landings

h = honey shrimp landings

cr = croaker landings

sd = seasonal dummy variables

ε = error terms

The Trophic VAR Model Specification: The Carite and Honey-Shrimp Fisheries

This 2-variable system is estimated with a lag length of 2, and 2 seasonal dummies included:

$$c_t = b_{10} + b_{11}h_t + b_{12}sd_{1t} + \gamma_{11}h_{t-1} + \gamma_{12}h_{t-2} + \gamma'_{11}c_{t-1} + \gamma'_{12}c_{t-2} + \varepsilon_{ct}$$

$$h_t = b_{20} + b_{21}c_t + b_{22}sd_{1t} + \gamma_{21}c_{t-1} + \gamma_{22}c_{t-2} + \gamma'_{21}h_{t-1} + \gamma'_{22}h_{t-2} + \varepsilon_{ht}$$

The Choleski decomposition is imposed to set the current honey-shrimp landings h_t in the first equation to 0.

The Bycatch VAR Model Specification: The Honey-Shrimp and Croaker Fisheries

This 2-variable system is estimated with a lag length of 15, and 2 seasonal dummies included:

$$h_t = b_{10} + b_{11}cr_t + b_{12}sd_{2t} + \gamma_{11}cr_{t-1} + \dots + \gamma_{1(15)}cr_{t-15} + \gamma'_{11}h_{t-1} + \dots + \gamma'_{1(15)}h_{t-15} + \varepsilon_{ht}$$
$$cr_t = b_{20} + b_{21}h_t + b_{22}sd_{2t} + \gamma_{21}h_{t-1} + \dots + \gamma_{2(15)}h_{t-15} + \gamma'_{21}cr_{t-1} + \dots + \gamma'_{2(15)}cr_{t-15} + \varepsilon_{crt}$$

The Choleski decomposition is imposed to set the current croaker landings cr_t in the first equation to 0.

The Multispecies VAR Model Specification: The Carite and Croaker Fisheries

This 2-variable system is estimated with a lag length of 2, and 2 seasonal dummies included:

$$c_t = b_{10} + b_{11}cr_t + b_{12}sd_{1t} + b_{13}sd_{2t} + \gamma_{11}cr_{t-1} + \gamma_{12}cr_{t-2} + \gamma'_{11}c_{t-1} + \gamma'_{12}c_{t-2} + \varepsilon_{ct}$$
$$cr_t = b_{20} + b_{21}c_t + b_{22}sd_{1t} + b_{23}sd_{2t} + \gamma_{21}c_{t-1} + \gamma_{22}c_{t-2} + \gamma'_{21}cr_{t-1} + \gamma'_{22}cr_{t-2} + \varepsilon_{crt}$$

The Choleski decomposition is imposed to set the current croaker landings cr_t in the first equation to 0.

The Aggregate VAR Specification: The Carite, Honey-Shrimp and Croaker Fisheries

This 3-variable system is estimated with a lag length of 2, and 3 seasonal dummies included:

$$c_t = b_{10} + b_{11}h_t + b_{12}cr_t + b_{13}sd_{1t} + b_{14}sd_{2t} + \gamma_{11}h_{t-1} + \gamma_{12}h_{t-2} + \gamma'_{11}cr_{t-1} + \gamma'_{12}cr_{t-2} + \gamma''_{11}c_{t-1} + \gamma''_{12}c_{t-2} + \varepsilon_{ct}$$
$$h_t = b_{20} + b_{21}c_t + b_{22}cr_t + b_{23}sd_{1t} + b_{24}sd_{2t} + \gamma_{21}c_{t-1} + \gamma_{22}c_{t-2} + \gamma'_{21}cr_{t-1} + \gamma'_{22}cr_{t-2} + \gamma''_{21}h_{t-1} + \gamma''_{22}h_{t-2} + \varepsilon_{ht}$$
$$cr_t = b_{30} + b_{31}h_t + b_{32}c_t + b_{33}sd_{1t} + b_{34}sd_{2t} + \gamma_{31}h_{t-1} + \gamma_{32}h_{t-2} + \gamma'_{31}c_{t-1} + \gamma'_{32}c_{t-2} + \gamma''_{31}cr_{t-1} + \gamma''_{32}cr_{t-2} + \varepsilon_{crt}$$

The Choleski decomposition is imposed to set the current honey shrimp landings h_t and current croaker landings cr_t in the first equation to 0.

References

- Arnason, R. (2000), "Economic instruments for achieving ecosystem objectives in fisheries management" *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 57, pp. 742-751.
- Bache, S. (2003), "Bycatch mitigation tools: selecting fisheries, setting limits, and modifying gear", *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 46, pp. 103-125
- Bass, S.M.J. (1993), "Ecology and economics in small islands: constructing a framework for sustainable development", in E.B. Barbier (ed.), *Economics and Ecology: New Frontiers and Sustainable Development*, Chapman and Hall, London 1993.
- Bax, N. J. (1998), "The significance and prediction of predation in marine fisheries", *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 55, pp. 997-1030.
- Boodoosingh, M. (1992) "A review of the possible impacts of human activities on fisheries in the coastal waters of Trinidad, with emphasis on the Gulf of Paria" Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources. POS (T&T) Fish. Occas. Pap. Ser. No.2
- Boyce, J. (1996), "An Economic Analysis of the Fisheries Bycatch Problem", *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 31, pp 314-336.
- Caddy, J. and Cochrane, K. (2001) "A review of fisheries management past and present and some future perspectives for the third millennium" *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 44, pp 653-682.
- Cochrane, K. (1999) "Complexity in fisheries and limitations in the increasing complexity of fisheries management" *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 56, pp 917-926.
- Michael G. Dalton (2001), "El Nino, Expectations, and Fishing Effort in Monterey Bay, California", *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 42, pp 336-359.

Dedah, S. Ould, Condrey, R.E and R.F. Shaw (1999), "Conservative fit of the Schaefer model for a multispecies fishery", *Fisheries Research*, 41, pp 155-168.

Dolman, A.J. (1990), "The Potential Contribution of Marine Resources to Sustainable Development in Small-Island Developing Countries", in Beller, W., P. D'Ayala and P. Hein, (Eds), *Sustainable Development and Environmental Management of Small Islands*. Man and the Biosphere Series. Volume 5. UNESCO, Paris, and Parthenon Publishing Carnforth.1990.

Enders, W. (2004) "Applied Econometric Time Series" Wiley

F.A.O. (1999), "*Fisheries and Aquaculture Issues in Small Island Developing States*", Paper Presented at The Committee on Fisheries, Twenty Third Session, Rome, Italy, 15-19 February 1999.

Fisheries Division (1993) "Integrated Coastal Fisheries Management" Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources, Trinidad and Tobago FAO/UNDP Project INT/91/007

Fisheries Division (1993) "The carite fishery of Trinidad and Tobago" Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources, Trinidad and Tobago

Fisheries Division (1993) "The demersal trawl fishery of Trinidad and Tobago" Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources, Trinidad and Tobago

Fisheries Division (1993) "The groundfish fishery of Trinidad and Tobago" Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources, Trinidad and Tobago

Food and Agricultural Organization (1998) "Integrated Coastal Fisheries Management Interregional: Project Findings and Recommendations, Terminal Report, the Gambia, the Phillipenes, T&T" FAO of the UN acting as executing agency for the UNDP

Food and Agricultural Organization (2001) "Regional Reviews and National Management Reports- 4th Workshop on the Assessment and Management of Shrimp and Groundfish Fisheries on the Brazil-Guianas Shelf" Western Atlantic Central Fisheries Commission

Food and Agricultural Organization (2003) "FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries 4, Fisheries Management 2: The ecosystem approach to fisheries" FAO of the UN Gislason, H., Sinclair, M., Sainsbury, K., and O'Boyle, R. (2000), "Symposium overview:incorporating ecosystem objectives within fisheries management" *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 57, pp 468–475.

Goni, R. (1998) "Ecosystem effects of marine fisheries: an overview" *Ocean and Coastal Management* 40

Johanna J. Heymans, Lynne J. Shannon, Astrid Jarre (2004), "Changes in the northern Benguela ecosystem over three decades: 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s". *Ecological Modelling*, 172, 175–195

Le Pape, O and J. Vigneau (2001), "The influence of vessel size and fishing strategy on the fishing effort for multispecies fisheries in northwestern France", *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 58, pp 1232–1242

Manickchand-Heileman, S., Mendoza, H., Lum Kong, A. and Arocha, F. (2004) "A trophic model for exploring possible ecosystem impacts of fishing in the Gulf of Paria, between Venezuela and Trinidad" *Ecological Modelling* 172

Mardle, S., Pascoe, S., Boncoeur, J., Le Gallic, B., Gracia-Hoyo, J., Herrero, I., Jimenez-Yoribio, R., Cortes, C., Padilla, N., Nielsen, J. and Mathiesen, C. (2002) "Objectives of fisheries management: case studies for the UK, France, Spain and Denmark" *Marine Policy* 26

McAllister, M. K., Starr, P. J., Restrepo, V. R., and Kirkwood, G. P. (1999), "Formulating quantitative methods to evaluate fishery-management systems: what fishery processes should be modelled and what trade-offs should be made?", *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 56, pp 900–916.

Norman, F. (2000), "Preliminary investigation of the bycatch of marine birds and mammals in inshore commercial fisheries, Victoria, Australia" *Biological Conservation*, 92, pp 217-226

Parsons, T.R. (1992) "The removal of marine predators by fisheries and the impact of trophic structure." *Marine pollution bulletin* Vol. 24, 1-4

Roberts, Callum (1997) "Ecological advice for the global fisheries crisis" *TREE* Vol. 12 No. 1

Shannon, Lynne J. and Philippe M. Cury (2003), "Indicators quantifying small pelagic fish interactions: application using a trophic model of the southern Benguela ecosystem", *Ecological Indicators*, 3, 305–321

Stergiou, K.I., (1991). Describing and forecasting the sardine-anchovy complex in the eastern Mediterranean using vector autoregressions. *Fish. Res.*, 1 I: 127- 141.

Stergiou, K., Christou, E. and Petrakis, G. (1997) "Modelling and forecasting monthly fisheries catches: comparison of regression, univariate and multivariate time series methods" *Fisheries Research* 29

Stobutzki, I. Jones, P. and M Miller (2003), "A comparison of fish bycatch communities between areas open and closed to prawn trawling in an Australian tropical fishery", *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 60, pp 951–966.

Squires, Dale and James Kirkley (1995), "Resource rents from single and multispecies transferable quota programs". *ICES J. mar. Sci.*, 52, pp 153-164.

Tegner, Mia J. and Paul K. Dayton (1999), "Ecosystem Effects of Fishing", *TREE* Vol. 14, No. 1

Walters, C. J., Christensen, V., and Pauly, D. 1997. Structuring dynamic models of exploited ecosystems from trophic massbalance assessments. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 7: 139–172.

Watson, Patrick K. and Sonja S. Teelucksingh (2002), *A Practical Introduction to Econometric Methods: Classical and Modern*, UWI Press